UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/313,436	05/17/1999	DAVID S. SPRINGER	M-7260US	3911

7590   07/16/2003

DAVID L MCCOMBS
HAYNES & BOONE LLP
901 MAIN STREET
SUITE 3100
DALLAS, TX 75202-3789

EXAMINER
LE, KHANH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3622	

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r she t with the correspond nce address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>4/16/03</u>

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1, 4-9, and 26</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1, 4-9, and 26</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

Detailed Action/ Response to Applicant's Correspondence filed 4/16/03

1.   This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's Correspondence filed 4/16/03 (paper # 14 and 15: Amendment dated 4/16/03, petition for extension of time).

2.   Per request of the Amendment, amendments to the specifications have been entered.

Claims 2, 3, 25 are cancelled as requested. Amendment of Claims 1 and 26 has been entered.

Claims 1, 4-9, and 26 remain pending in the application. Claims 1 and 26 are independent.

Examiner's Note

3.   **Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claims, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is requested from the Applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed inventions, as well as the context of the passages as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.**

Previous Objections to Specifications

4.   Are withdrawn.

Claims Objections

5.   Previous objections are withdrawn.

6.   Claim 8 is objected to because "the advertisement broker and the server being combined" is superfluous in view of newly amended claim 1's combination of ad broker/server.

Claim rejections 35 USC 112

7.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Previous Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 3, 25 are withdrawn.

Newly amended Claims 1, 4-9 and 26 are however rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Appropriate corrections are required.

As for claim 1: while it is reasonable from the claim language to interpret the user transmits the identifier to the combination ad broker/server, there is no linkage between the database and the combination ad broker/server so that the database can have access to the identifier so to associate it with any information.

All claims dependent on claim 1 are similarly rejected because of their dependency.

Further, Claim 4, dependent on claim 1, fails to further limit claim 1 and contradicts claim 1. Claim 1 claims a combination " advertisement broker and server" . Claim 4 then claims the "server" (i.e. the " advertisement broker and server") possibly to be other than "an advertisement broker", thereby failing to further limit and contradicting claim 1.

Claim 9, dependent on claim 1, is rejected as contradictory to claim 1: claim 1 claims a combination sever/ad broker while claim 9 claims that they are separate. Appropriate correction is required. This latter part of the claim is thus ignored in the application of prior art because of substantial uncertainty in the scope of the claim.

As for claim 26:

Claim 26 is unclear as to which component transmits the identifier to the broker. Applicant states that this claim has been amended to specify the user transmits to the ad broker (page 7 of Amendment) , however the claim still is not so amended. Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Remarks

8.   Applicant's arguments are unpersuasive. Newly amended claim 1is interpreted as incorporating the limitations of previous claims 8 and 5-6 and is now rejected based on the same rationales as were previous claims 8 and 5-6.

As to new amended limitation in claim 1 , "The database associating with the identifier and providing the computer user with a choice of specific advertisements, no advertisements, banner advertisements and informational banners", it is interpreted as a combination of the previous claims 5 and 6.

"Claim 5: The method of Claim 1, the database searching and locating advertisements that match criteria provided by the computer user during a querying procedure.
Claim 6: The method of Claim 5 wherein if no matching criteria is found the database transmitting one of generic advertisements or no advertisements".

As stated in the previous Office Action, the Reilly user is provided with a choice of indicating preferences during a querying procedure. The preferences define the ads to be served. Reilly also discloses a filter procedure to include or exclude specific categories/subcategories. Thus impliedly, for example, if the Reilly user specifies exclusion of all categories in his profile (Fig 5) , the server will find no matching content and therefore ads, and thus will return no ads.   Therefore it is interpreted that the Reilly user was provided with a choice of receiving specific advertisements, or no advertisements.

Thus all the limitations of claims 1, and 26 are met by the *Reilly et al.* patent, in view of other well-known facts under 35 USC § 103 as presented below.

In view of the amendments to the claims the previous rejections under 35 USC § 103 are withdrawn, and replaced with the ones below, except for some unchallenged Officially Noticed facts which are taken as admitted and repeated below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

10.   Claims 1, 4-9, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly et al., US 5740549 in view of other well-known business and computer methods.

As to Claim 1, Reilly discloses

(Currently Amended) A method of tracking information provided to a computer system from a <u>combination advertisement broker and</u> server, the method comprising:

providing an identifier identifying the computer system, (Fig 4 and associated text especially item 212, 213; description of Fig 4, col 3)

(Reilly does not specifically disclose <u>the identifier being imbedded in one of the computer hardware and firmware in the computer system</u> however Official Notice had been taken earlier, at least , that a unique identifier stored on a hard drive is well-known.

(See previous rejection of claim 8:*"It is well-known that the identifier can be one of those above as claimed."*)   The Officially Noticed fact was unchallenged and therefore taken as admitted. MPEP 2144.03.

One skilled in the arts would have known to use an identifier embedded in the hardware to apply to the Reilly's system as one way to implement it.

> providing at least one database associating the identifier with information specific to a computer user associated with the computer system (Figs 1 and associated text, especially items 104, 134: information data; col 14 l. 17 –col 16 l. 35; Fig 4 and associated text especially items 212, 213);

> Reilly further discloses
> the computer user logging onto an advertisement broker and a server
> *" An information administrator in each workstation establishes*
> *communication with the data server from time to time so as to update the*
> *information items and advertisements stored in local memory ...*

> *When a client computer first initiates a connection to the information server,*
> *it sends a first message to the Internet address associated with a router*
> *process 270 in the information server. The router selects an application*
> *server 272 with at least one available thread and passes back to the client*
> *computer an Internet address associated with that application server.*

> the computer user transmitting the identifier

> *The client computer then sends a portion of its user profile to the assigned*
> *application server.*

> *Based on ... the information in the transmitted user profile,*
> *the application server determines ... what new*
> *information needs to be downloaded to the client computer .. The*
> *application server 272 then makes calls to one or more data servers 274 to*
> *collect all the information that needs to be sent to the client computer and*
> *then sends those items to the client computer...*

(Figs 11 and 12 and associated text; col 14 l. 17 –col 16 l. 35; Fig 4 and associated text especially items 212, 213; *"Based on ... the information in the transmitted user profile,*
the application server determines... ": the profile includes the identifier, Fig 4 item 194 and associated text);

> **As to the combination advertisement broker/server (limitation in previous claim 8), the following explanation was provided and hereby reiterated:**

"Reilly discloses locating matching ads from many different data servers, but does not specifically disclose the advertisement broker and the server being combined.

"Based on the time of day and the information in the transmitted user profile, the application <u>server</u> determines (A) what type of update is to be performed (i.e., a news item update or an administrative update), and (B) what new information needs to be downloaded to the client computer and what items in the client computer's local information database should be deleted. The application <u>server</u> 272 then makes calls to one or more data <u>servers</u> 274 to collect all the information that needs to be sent to the client computer and then sends those items to the client computer..."

However, the <u>advertisement broker and the server being combined,</u> is old art:

An advertisement broker is herein taken as an agent for one or several advertisers (no definition of an ad broker is included in the specifications)

See e.g. Goldhaber, which discloses a single combined ad broker/server per product/service category

" There can be many attention brokerage servers 106. Each attention brokerage server may serve a specific interest area (e.g., opera, winter sports, etc.), a specific geographic area, a specific demographic area, or any combination of these. FIG. 10 shows an example arrangement including two attention brokerage servers 106(1), 106(2)...<u>Attention brokerage server 106(1) may broker advertising</u> and other information relating to winter sports in general or skiing in particular.....

...<u>Servers</u> 106 store information and disseminate it to consumer <u>computers</u> 104 over network 102. For example, <u>servers</u> 106 may act as "attention brokers" or "trading houses," and may supply consumer software agent 110 with advertisements or other information to be viewed or reviewed by consumers.

Also see e.g. Murray; US 6061659

"...Downloading messages from the servers typically takes place after a third party such as an advertiser compensates the owner, publisher, and/or distributor of the content for the right to include the message within the content. Either directly or through an <u>agent, the advertiser or other third party prepares and produces the message and stores the message on a message server</u> in a useable format.

*....Referring now to FIGS. 1 and 2, an interactive system according to a first embodiment of the present invention is shown utilizing the basic architecture of the Internet. The system comprises a <u>computer</u> network, generally designated 10, having an object manager 30 which scales and integrates information such as a message from a message <u>server</u> 40 or content <u>servers</u> 36 and 38 into selected content retrieved from a content <u>server</u> 36 or access provider content <u>server</u> 38. Content may be stored either on the access provider content <u>server</u> 38 or content <u>servers</u> hosting web sites 36. **Likewise, messages may be stored on any content <u>server</u> and/or a message <u>server</u>"***

In Murray the advertiser "agent" is taken to be the claimed advertising broker which stores the (ad) message on any server, impliedly including its own, thus the server is a combined ad broker/server.

Also See e.g. Roth US 6285987 B1 disclosing targeted ads to web pages using a central ad server (ad broker/server combination) with ad bidding capabilities:

"There are commercially available systems which provide advertising material for web sites from a central <u>server</u> and various web pages have HTML references to this central <u>server</u> With such an arrangement, when a viewer accesses a web page which has an appropriate HTML reference, the viewer sees advertisement that is provided by the central <u>server</u> .

There are prior art systems which provide advertisements from a central <u>server</u>
that has a data base of information concerning characteristics of viewers.

One skilled in the art would have known to combine the known art of a combined advertisement broker /server, such as disclosed by Goldhaber or Murray, to Reilly, all involved with ads, to allow flexibility of ads serving in the Reilly system, from any convenient server such as taught by Murray, or for specialized categorization such as taught by Goldhaber.

As to new amended limitation
"The database associating with the identifier and providing the computer user with a choice of specific advertisements, no advertisements, banner advertisements and informational banners", it is interpreted as a combination of previous claims 5 and 6 (see remarks above).

Reilly discloses ads delivery via World Wide Web (see at least Fig 6 and associated text, claim 18; col 16, Table 2; Figs 11 and 12 and associated text; col 14 1. 17 –col 16 1. 35; Fig 4 and associated text especially items 212, 213; citations above) but does not specifically disclose banner ads. However serving banner ads through public network systems, such as the World Wide Web, is admitted prior art (Fig 2 and associated specifications) thus one skilled in the art would have known to add banner ads to the Reilly's system to implement the Reilly's system on the World Wide Web.

As to providing a specific advertisements, as discussed in previous claim 5,
"Reilly discloses a querying procedure wherein criteria(interpreted as user profile/preferences) are provided by the user to match data/ads of interest (Figs 5, 7A-B and associated text; also see Figs 3 and 4 re. user profilers).

As for the database searching and locating advertisements that match criteria provided, Reilly discloses providing information as ads and also discloses " *"Based on ... the information in the transmitted user profile, the application server determines... B) what*

information needs to be downloaded to the client computer" i.e. the information, including ads, is matched to the profile.

(Further note: matching ads to user profiles is old art, see e.g. Goldhaber/ US 5794210 A, which further discloses user profiles can be stored on any system database (Fig 1 and text) "
        ...In this example, the consumer interest profiles 124 may be stored at consumer computers 104 and/or at attention brokerage servers 106.
`   *...These software agents 110 can "live" anywhere in system 100. The function of software agent 110 is to screen or filter ads 68 (or other forms of information that may be competing for the attention of consumers 64) against the consumer interest profiles 124. ..."* "

As to the database providing generic advertisements or no advertisements, .
Reilly discloses a filter procedure to include or exclude specific categories/subcategories (see Fig 5 and associated text)

See further, Col 16 table 2, *"For each Category Manager (CMx) [/* CMx.Fetch Procedure: */ Client (CMx.Fetch procedure) sends profile data for CMx to Server, including subcategory data and filter data, if any. Server sends items consistent with profile data"*

Thus impliedly, for example, if the Reilly user specifies exclusion of all categories in his profile (Fig 5) , the server will find no matching content and therefore ads and will return no ads, as claimed.

Therefore it is interpreted that the Reilly user was provided with a choice of receiving specific advertisements, or no advertisements.

As to the choice of "banner advertisements and informational banners", Reilly discloses ads delivery via World Wide Web (see at least Fig 6 and associated text, claim 18; col 16, Table 2; Figs 11 and 12 and associated text; col 14 l. 17 –col 16 l. 35; Fig 4 and associated text especially items 212, 213; citations above) but does not specifically disclose banner ads. However serving banner ads through public network systems, such as the World Wide Web, is admitted prior art (Fig 2 and associated specifications) thus one skilled in the art would have known to add banner ads to the Reilly's system to implement the Reilly's system on the World Wide Web.

As for claims 4-9, the method of claim 1 is disclosed as above-discussed.

Claim 4. Reilly discloses further providing that the server is one of an advertisement broker (see claim 1 above).

(Also Reilly discloses the server could be a server hosting advertisements, and a server hosting advertisements and informational data. (Figs 11 and 12 and associated text; see claims 1-2;

Also see Reilly, " *When using the data viewer, if subscriber user clicks on the displayed advertisement, the subscriber's computer is automatically connected to the an associated World Wide Web page on the Internet that provides additional information from the advertiser.*

(Per whatis.com, Hosting is defined as :
http://searchwebservices.techtarget.com/sDefinition/0,,sid26_gci213581,00.html
"Hosting (also known as *Web site hosting*, *Web hosting*, and *Webhosting*) is the business of housing, serving, and maintaining files for one or more Web sites").)

5.   (Previously Amended) The method of Claim 1 further comprising: the database searching and locating advertisements that match criteria provided by the computer user during a querying procedure.

Reilly discloses a querying procedure wherein criteria(interpreted as user profile/preferences) are provided by the user to match data/ads of interest (Figs 5, 7A-B and associated text; also see Figs 3 and 4 re. user profilers).

As for the database searching and locating advertisements that match criteria provided, Reilly discloses providing information as ads and also discloses "   "*Based on ... the information in the transmitted user profile, the application server determines... B) what information needs to be downloaded to the client computer*" i.e. the information, including ads, is matched to the profile.

(Further note: matching ads to user profiles is old art, see e.g. Goldhaber/ US 5794210 A, which further discloses user profiles can be stored on any system database (Fig 1 and text) "
      ...In this example, the consumer interest profiles 124 may be stored at consumer computers 104 and/or at attention brokerage servers 106.
`   *...These software agents 110 can "live" anywhere in system 100. The function of software agent 110 is to screen or filter ads 68 (or other forms of information that may be competing for the attention of consumers 64) against the consumer interest profiles 124. ...*"

As to Claim 6. (Previously Amended): The method of Claim 5 wherein if no matching criteria is found the database transmitting one of generic advertisements or no advertisements.

Reilly discloses a filter procedure to include or exclude specific categories/subcategories (see Fig 5 and associated text)

See further,Col 16 table 2, *"For each Category Manager (CMx)   [/* CMx.Fetch Procedure: */ Client (CMx.Fetch procedure) sends profile data for CMx to Server, including subcategory data and filter data, if any. Server sends items consistent with profile data"*

Thus impliedly, for example, if the Reilly user specifies exclusion of all categories in his profile (Fig 5) , the server will find no matching content and therefore ads and will return no ads, as claimed.

Claim 7.   (Previously(Twice) Amended) The method of Claim 5 wherein the database checks for the identifier
(see Reilly, Fig 11s and 12 and associated text; Also, Reilly: "a connection password 213 used in conjunction with the subscriber identifier when connecting to the information server to identify the calling computer as a registered subscriber"
Also see, "For instance, in an alternate embodiment of the present invention, **the server's information database 134 also includes** a client catalog which lists all
subscribers authorized to receive news items and advertisements from the server, including a connection password that is checked whenever the
subscriber's computer calls the information server for an update).
Thus via checking the password, the Reilly database checks the associated identifier, as claimed.

Claim 8.   (Amended) The method of Claim 1 wherein the identifier is one of a system code, a system code stored in nonvolatile memory, a unique ID from a microprocessor, a unique ID from a peripheral device and a unique identifier stored on a hard drive, the advertisement broker and the server being combined.

It is well-known that the identifier can be one of those above claimed. (This Official Notice was taken in earlier Office Actions, was not challenged and therefore taken as admitted). One skilled in the arts would have known to use one of those to apply to the Reilly's system to implement it.

Claim 9. (Previously Amended) The method of Claim 1 wherein the information unique to the computer user includes one of incentives, bonuses and discounts on a plurality of goods, the advertisement broker and the server being separate.

Reilly does not specifically disclose such but they are usually well-known parts of advertisements (disclosed by Reilly , Fig 1, item 138 and associated text) thus one skilled in the

arts would have known to combine them with Reilly's disclosure to provide customized incentives,(also , e.g., in affinity schemes) which are a well-known business methods.

As to "the advertisement broker and the server being separate" , this limitation contradicts with claim 1, thus the limitation is herein ignored as substantial doubt as to the scope of the claim is introduced.

Claim 26 essentially claims the same steps as claim 1 in broader terms and is rejected similarly.

Conclusion

11.   All prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Note: **Goldhaber, Griffiths et al, and Roth,** alone, or in combination with other well-known methods, could be used to reject most claims.

Griffiths et al, US 6286045 B1 discloses a banner ads display monitoring method/system , where storage of the ads can be on many databases, including user computer local database, as convenient, and separate ad broker/server .

*A system for storing information on a computer network and allowing the information to be accessed by terminals connected to the computer network, **either directly, or through an intermediary device such as a local or proxy server,** includes computer or web sites which store pages requested by terminals for display on the terminals. The pages may include references to banners to be displayed in conjunction with the web pages on the terminal. The terminal initiates access or connection to a desired computer or web site to access a desired page. **After the desired page is downloaded, transmitted, or served to the terminal from the computer or web site, the terminal initiates and sends an initial banner request signal to an information server. The information server returns a redirect signal to the terminal telling the terminal the location of the desired banner on the computer network, which may be the information server, the computer site, or some other information server, computer site, or location accessible via the computer network.** The terminal then initiates a second banner request signal to the location of the desired banner and the banner is served to the terminal for display on the terminal, unless the requested banner has previously been stored or **cached in the terminal's memory***

or in the memory of a local or proxy server connected to the terminal, in which
case the second banner request signal is not sent across the computer network
and the banner is loaded directly from the terminal's memory or served to the
terminal from the proxy server.

The growth of easy access to the World Wide Web and the ability to create
visually pleasing web pages have helped increase the amount of advertising and
other promotional materials created for use and display with web pages. For
example, a car manufacturer may have a web page describing the company and the
cars and car parts that the company manufactures and sells. Part of the web
page may include advertising information or banners such as, for example,
images of current car models sold by the manufacturer or the types and numbers
or cars the manufacturer has in stock. The car manufacturer may also contract
with the owners or operators of other web pages to have the car manufacturer's
advertisement banners displayed when users access these other web pages.
Similarly, an advertising agency(that's the broker) may contract with various web sites to have
the advertisement banners of the agency's clients displayed when users access
the web pages stored on the web sites. For example, an advertising agency or
ad-network firm may contract with a web site containing general information
about cars to have advertising information or banners included on the web pages
displayed to a user accessing the web site. The advertising banners may
contain graphics, text, etc. about car models or car parts manufactured by on
of the advertising agency's clients. Furthermore, the advertisement banners
may not be stored on the same server or computer or web site on which the web
page is stored. Rather, all or a significant portion of the <u>advertisement
banners created by an advertising agency may reside on one or more information
or ad servers</u> . Typically, an advertising agency will pay a fixed amount of
money for a fixed number of displays of its advertisement banners on a single
web page or group of web pages. Therefore, advertising agencies are
understandably very interested in knowing which advertisement banners have been
displayed with which web pages and how often each advertisement banner has been
displayed on terminals or otherwise served to terminals.

12.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in
this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).
Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
     A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO
MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after
the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period
will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37
CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,
however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this
final action.

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh H. Le whose telephone number is 703-305-0571. The Examiner works a part-time schedule and can best be reached on Tuesday-Wednesday 9:00-6:00. The examiner can also be reached at the e-mail address: khanh.le2@uspto.gov. (However, Applicants are cautioned that confidentiality of email communications cannot be assured.)

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 703-305-8469. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.
Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

July 10,2003

KHL

Steve Gravini · for aws

STEPHEN GRAVINI
PRIMARY EXAMINER